

AN ARGUMENT

Proving,

That the Imposition of the Sacrament
of the Lord's Supper, as a Qualifi-
cation for a Secular Office,

IS

- I. Contrary to the Express Laws of God.
- II. Contrary to the Doctrines of the Church of
England.
- III. Contrary to the Doctrines of the Dissenters.
And,
- IV. Contrary to the National and Natural
Rights of all Mankind.

In which the Reasonableness and Necessity of taking
away the *Sacramental Test* at this Juncture, is
particularly consider'd.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *A. Baldwin* near the Oxford Arms in
Warwick-lane. M.DCC.I.

A N

ARGUMENT

Proving

That the Imposition of the Sacrament
of the Lord's Supper, as a Qualification
for a Secular Office,

1 2

I. Contrary to the Express Laws of God.
II. Contrary to the Doctrines of the Church of

England.

III. Contrary to the Principles of the Divine

48

10

11

IV. Contrary to the National and Natural

Rights of all Mankind.

In which the Reader will find
every Argument fully stated,
and every Objection carefully
considered.



Printed for J. Baskin, near the Oxford Arms in

LONDON:

Printed for J. Baskin near the Oxford Arms in
WINDSOR, MDCCLXXII.

EPISTLE to a Member of Parliament.

Honoured Sir,

YOU have seen several of my Tracts concerning Government, wherein I have abode by our antient Constitution, it being, as I believe, the best constituted Form of Government in the World. We of the English Nation have no reason to complain of our Forefathers, who have left us such valuable Rights, defended with such able Fences and Bulwarks, that we our selves can make no addition to their Strength; and which will last to the utmost period of time, if we our selves make no Dilapidations upon them with our own hands.

Such are our native Freedoms, and such is our holy Religion, if we can but content our selves with those Laws established by the Wisdom of the Almighty, without any Additions of our own, that we may say, he has not dealt so with any other Nation. God, who contriv'd the means of Man's Salvation, has placed the Marks by which we are to avoid Destruction, better than we our selves could put them; and while we alter his Laws to other ends and purposes than he at first design'd them in their Institution, we rob him of his chief Prerogative, his Legislative Power, as he is the sole Head, King and Governour of his Church.

This Argument is thought more seasonable at this time, when the Popish Powers of Europe are uniting their Forces to destroy what they call the Northern Heresy; and England being the chief Bulwark of the Reformed Religion, it behoves all Englishmen to unite in the common Cause, as well as in defence of their Country; for Religion and Liberty must expect to be buried in one Grave, if ever we are overcome.

I do not speak, Sir, on behalf of any Party in this Argument, any farther than as they are oppress'd, disfranchis'd, and denied their native Freedoms, which at this juncture may prove fatal to our Realm; for I suppose none will deny that the Nation at this time stands in need of the Service of all its Members. Nor would I endeavour to draw you off from the Church of England, any farther than to allow all Mankind their native Liberty, who are not of her Communion. For my part I acknowledg but one Church in the World, which is the Church of Christ, and believe all men fearing God, and working Righteousness, to be of that Church. This Church is built upon a sure Foundation, and needs not the weak Auxiliaries of human Force to support it; and all men have a right to that Liberty wherein Christ has set them free: So that in point of Religion and Civil Liberty there is no man in England but what is a Freeman.

I would also remark, that the Oppression and Persecution in those Countries where Popery is established, has its rise from the Destruction of the Peoples Liberties; and I cannot but think that if the Protestants in France had bravely defended their Civil Rights, their Religious ones had not now been in so deplorable a condition: For in those Countries where the Protestant Religion does most flourish, the Liberties of the People are kept most sacred and inviolable; so that to preserve our Religion, is to maintain our Civil Liberty.

I shall conclude only with this Question, viz. Whether at this juncture a Civil Test, instead of the Sacrament, would not be more beneficial to our common good? Such a Test would be a sufficient bar to keep Papists and Enemies to the Government out of Offices, without any profanation of God's Holy Ordinance, as it will set all the Natives of England in the same state of Freedom. All which is submitted to your wiser Judgment.

A N

Argument, &c.

IN managing this Argument, I shall take this Method:

- I. I shall prove that receiving the Sacrament as a Qualification for an Employment is contrary to the exprefs Law of God.
- II. That it is contrary to the Doctrines of the Church of *England*.
- III. That it is contrary to the Doctrines of the *Presbyterians*, and other Dissenters from the Church of *England*: And
- IV. That it is contrary to the National and Natural Rights of all Mankind.

I shall not in this Argument, as the late Contestors have done, urge the practice of former Churches, nor enforce my Argument by saying that such a Father did so, or that it was the practice of former times. Truth stands upon its own Legs, and is unshaken like the Pillars of the Universe. It matters me not, what is the Opinion of Fathers, the Decrees of Councils, the Resolutions of Synods: Did God give our Forefathers a Right to judg not only for themselves but for their Posterity? if so, our Reason is subjugated to the arbitrary Opinions of our Predecessors,

decessors, we go hoodwinkt to Heaven, and grope out our Salvation in the dark. Therefore the Question in dispute is not concerning the Communion of Churches, or of one sort of Christians with another : But the making the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which is an Ordinance of Divine Institution, subservient to mean and secular Ends, and a Test to qualify Men for worldly Preferments ; which I shall prove is,

First, Contrary to the Law of God. By a Law in its general Notion, we are to understand, the Will of the Lawgiver requiring Duty ; in a more particular and appropriate sense, we are to understand by a Law the Design and Will of the Lawgiver enacting such a particular Law. No Laws are to be repeal'd otherwise than by the same Power which first enacted them : the Laws of God are the *Magna Charta* of Religion ; not alterable, as under the *Theocracy*, but handed down under a new Dispensation unalterable to Posterity : And whoever shall add or diminish from these Laws, incurs an *Anathema*. Now the appointing an Ordinance or Law of God, to any other end or purpose than what God himself, the supreme Lawgiver, has design'd it, is an altering, repealing, and downright vacating thereof : for in respect of God, his Laws are rendered of no force when they are applied to other ends and purposes, than what were at first design'd by his unerring Wisdom, and ordain'd by his infinite Power. When his Laws are clog'd with humane Additions or Alterations, the virtue of them is lost, and they are as if they had never been ; for Power is vain and useless when it is not brought into act. To illustrate this point more particularly in respect to the Sacrament, let us consider,

1st. The Lawgiver and Institutor of this Ordinance, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which was our Saviour Christ. I suppose my Antagonists will not openly deny him

him a power of making such a Law, tho they are very familiar with his Prerogative, in wresting and bending his Laws to their own secular Interest. Now look into the Statute, Gen. 17. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee, Every M^a-child among you shall be circumcised.* And also into the Statute recognizing and confirming the former, viz. Rom. 4. 11. *And he received the sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised.* As Christ the Lawgiver was the best Interpreter of the Law of Moses, so he knew best how to amend, alter, repeal, or institute a new one; the Prophets made good Expositions upon the Law of Moses, but Christ more clear and full, as we may see through the 5th Chapter of *Matth.* And tho our Saviour by a divine Power inherent in himself, as well as by the Authority and Commission of his Father, mended the Imperfections of the moral Law, his Laws are indisputably perfect, and he has left no Person in Commission to pass any Bill of Amendments of his Laws into an Act; and if such an Act be made by any humane Power or Authority whatsoever, it is *ipso facto* null and void of it self. It's true, the *Pope* (the Devil's Vicegerent here upon Earth) has taken the boldness upon him to add five Sacraments to the two which our Saviour has instituted; and so that Man of Sin has usurp'd an Authority, which the holiest Man upon Earth cannot pretend to: and if any among us do pretend to the like Authority, I would e'en have them honestly declare themselves Papists; and yet the Papists themselves in the Infancy of the Papal Authority did not so far-usurp upon God's Prerogative, or make Additions, new mould and mend his Laws, as now they do, as we may see in a Letter from Pope *Eleutherius* Bishop of *Rome*, to *Lucius* the first Christian King of *England*, which Mr. Speed says he found amongst

the authentick Records of the City of London in an antient Manuscript, Cap. 19. p. 103. of Speed's Chronicle; says the Pope to the King, *Leges Romanas, & Caesaris semper reprobare possumus, Legem Dei nequaquam, i. e. The Roman Laws, and the Emperor's at all times we may mislike, but the Law of God by no means:* and if the King does not govern according to the Laws of God, he tells him what he must trust to; *Rex dicitur a regendo, non a Regno; Rex eris dum bene regis; quod nisi feceris, nomen Regis non in te constabit, & nomen Regis perdes. i. e. A King takes his Name from governing, not from his Kingdom; as long as you rule well, shall you be a King; which if once you cease to do, the Name of a King will not continue with you, but you shall lose that Royal Title.* Have any of our Protestant Bishops for this hundred years said as much to a King as this comes to?

2ly. Let us consider the Law it self, and the Design of the Lawgiver in its Institution. This may be found, *Luk. 22. 19. And he took Bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my Body which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me; v. 20. Likewise the Cup after Supper, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you. 1 Cor. 10. 16. The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* To speak briefly, what may be gather'd from these Texts, declarative of the Nature of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is no more than this, That it is a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, of the Covenant of Grace, wherein Believers renew their Pacts and Promises of new obedience with God, and receive spiritual Nourishment to their Souls, and supernatural Assistances enabling them to persevere in the Course of their Christian Duty. But can any Man, even by a wicked

ked *Innuendo*, apply this Ordinance to secular ends? With what front can he say, that this Sacrament is a Seal to a secular Ministerial Commission; That the God of Peace who brought Jesus from the dead; That Jesus the Offspring of Heaven, the Son of his Love, the Mediator of the New Covenant, who gave his Cheek to the Smitters, and suffer'd an ignominious shameful Death, when he could have call'd millions of Angels with resistless fury to have deliver'd him from it; should institute this his sacred Ordinance as a Seal to the Commissions of Men of Blood, and thereby qualify Men to cut one anothers Throats? No, he was the God of Peace, his Doctrines the Doctrines of Peace, which had no regard to temporal Interest, or in their Nature were an Inlet to Offices of Profit and Trust; the whole Course of his Life was free from the Pageantry of worldly Pomp, nor was he rich in the goods of this World, tho the Treasures of the Earth and Sea were at his command: and in imitation of their great Master, such were the first Publishers of the Christian Religion; as a learned Bishop of the Church of *England* says, " They
 " did not go about to tempt and allure Men to their
 " way, by the promises of temporal Rewards, and by
 " the hopes of Riches and Honours; nor did they use any
 " artificial Insinuations of Wit and Eloquence, to gain
 " upon the Minds of Men, and steal their Doctrines into
 " them; but delivered themselves with the greatest plain-
 " ness and simplicity; and without any studied Ornaments
 " of Speech or fine Arts of persuasion, declared plainly to
 " them, the Doctrine and Miracles, the Life and Death
 " and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, promising Life and
 " Immortality to them that did believe and obey his Doc-
 " trine, and threatning eternal Wo and Misery in another
 " World to the Despisers of it. *Tillotson's Sermons, Vol. 2.*

3ly. Let us consider the signs and the things signify'd in this Ordinance, and then see whether they have any Analogy with, or Resemblance to secular Affairs. The Signs are Bread and Wine, outwardly representing by these Elements the Body and Blood of Christ; by the Bread his Body, and by the Wine his Blood: The spiritual signification of both is the Righteousness of Christ, and all the Benefits of his Mediatorship, bequested and sealed to Believers, who do by Faith apply them to themselves. *Maccovius Distinct.* p. 143. tells us from St. *Augustine*, *Nul-lum signum est sacramentale, nisi habet Analogiam cum re signata*; i. e. No sign is sacramental, but such as has Analogy with the thing signified. Now make an Office the Sign, What Analogy has it with the thing signified in the Sacrament? viz. the Righteousness of Christ. Or to make it yet more incongruous, *vice versa*, make it the thing signify'd, what relation has it to the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament? so that the use of the Sacrament in a civil Affair is directly contrary to the nature of a Sacrament, which is of divine Institution, and appointed for divine Ends and Purposes.

4ly. Let us consider the Qualifications of such as worthily receive the Lord's Supper, and see what proportion they bear with the Qualifications of such who are worthily admitted into Offices. The Qualifications of those who worthily receive the Lord's Supper, are these:

1. They are strictly to examine themselves, 1 Cor. 11. 28. whether they have knowledg to discern the Lord's Body: The Qualification of an Officer is to examine whether he understands the Employment he would acquire.

2. Whether they are in the Faith, 1 Cor. 11. 29. Of an Officer, whether he can trust in the great Man that recommends him.

3. Whether they have repented and judged themselves,
1 Cor.

1 Cor. 11. 31. Of an Officer, whether he has repented of the Injuries done by him in his private Capacity, and judges himself honest enough for an Employment. Where is the Analogy all this while, or any design of this nature in the Institution of the Lord's Supper?

The Effects of receiving unworthily are these,

(1.) Such Persons eat and drink their own Damnation, 1 Cor. 11. 29. The contrary Effects to Officers that come into Office unworthily, who are generally promoted, and eat and drink of the Fat of the Land.

(2.) They are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, 1 Cor. 11. 27. The contrary with Officers; they are guilty of a Peccadillo, which may be atoned with a small Sum of Money.

But to come yet a little closer to the Point;

5^{ly}. Let us consider the Sacrament as a Qualification in a strict and human sense, and see whether the Nature of it will admit it to be a Qualification in a political sense. The Nature of the Sacrament, and the Qualifications of such as receive it worthily, you have seen before: Now suppose a Person duly qualify'd, and worthily receiving the Lord's Supper, has a right thereby to the Benefits arising by that Ordinance; you cannot from hence gather that he is fitly qualify'd, and hath a right to an Office; there is as much difference betwixt the Qualifications for the Sacrament, and the Qualifications for an Office, as there is betwixt Grace and Nature it self. There are many take the Sacrament, that are entire Enemies to this Government, and present Settlement, who as such are not qualify'd for Offices: Will the Sacrament make them qualify'd? A Man may be a good Lawyer, and qualify'd to manage a Suit in Chancery, and yet not be qualify'd to build the King a House; Will his taking the Sacrament at the Church make him qualify'd for a Builder? From hence we must conclude,

clude, That the Qualification ought to be of the same nature with the Office the qualify'd Person is to enjoy : If a Civil Office, a Civil Qualification ; if a Religious Office, a religious Qualification. Contraries affect one another only to their destruction. Our Clergy would think it absurd to oblige them to subscribe the Massbook instead of the 39 Articles, in order to their admittance into Benefices ; and yet it is not so absurd as taking the Sacrament as an Admittance into a civil Employment ; the Massbook and 39 Articles being both religious. A Civil Test is most proper for Civil Employments, and a Religious Test for Religious Employments. The Laity and Clergy are Bodies Politick and Religious, and so differ in point of Constitution ; they enjoy distinct Privileges, and when one truckles to the other, it must be in prejudice to the Rights of the Persons so submitting, as in the case before us. Here the Laity are in prejudice of their Rights subservient to the Clergy, who are but their Servants, as holding their Living by no other Tenure than the Poor of the Land hold their Alms-houses. This is setting Men upon their bare Heads, and putting their Perriwigs upon their Feet. The Laity must first down on their Knees, and ask leave of their Servants the Clergy to receive an Office. And what if the Clergy refuse to give the Laity the Sacrament ? I know no course to compel them : so that the poor Layman must sit down contented with the Loss of the Office to which he was designed, for he hath not found favour in the eyes of him who is become his Lord and Master, the Priest.

When we appeal from one Court to another, we always appeal from an inferiour Court to a superiour, and that of the same nature with the inferiour : but here the Laity appeal to a Body of Men who are not only of a contrary Nature and Constitution, but likewise

wife in degree below themselves ; so that imposing the Sacrament as a qualification for an Office is not only contrary to the Law of God, and inconsistent with the nature of a true Qualification, but also a degrading of the Laity. I presume I have said enough to prove that this Practice is neither prescrib'd nor allow'd by the Law of God, but contrary to it. I shall now proceed to show that the Opinion and Doctrine of the Church of *England* is the same, however its practice has for some time been, and is at the present.

II. That it is contrary to the Doctrines of the Church of *England*, appears by *Art. 25*. " There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, " *i. e.* Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. Here Christ is acknowledged to be the Lawgiver and Instituter of this Ordinance. Again, *Art. 28*. " It is a Sacrament of our " Redemption by Christ's Death ; insomuch that to such " as rightly, worthily, and with Faith receive the same, " the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of " Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking " of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the " Change of the Substance of Bread and Wine) in the " Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ ; " but it is repugnant to the plain Words of Scripture, " overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given " occasion to many Superstitions. Now query whether the changing of this Divine Ordinance into a human and Civil Test, be not as absurd as the Conversion of the Elements into contrary Bodies endow'd with different Qualities in the Popish Eucharist, and in effect a mere Transubstantiation?

In the same Article ; " The Body of Christ is given, " taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly
C " and

“ and spiritual manner ; and the Mean whereby the Body
 “ of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.
 But as a Test is it not eaten after a corporeal and carnal
 manner, or is Faith or any Spiritual act exercised there-
 in, when the ultimate End and Design of the Agent is
 the Acquisition of a temporal and secular Preferment ?

Let us a little examine their Homilies, and see how they
 agree with this Doctrin and Practice. *To. 2. Hom. XV.* “ We
 “ must certainly know that three things be requisite in him
 “ which would seemingly, as becometh such high Mysteries,
 “ resort to the Lord’s Table, *i. e.* 1. A right and worthy
 “ Estimation and Understanding of this Mystery. 2. To
 “ come in a sure Faith. 3. To have newness or pureness
 “ of Life to succeed the receiving of the same. *P. 2.*
 “ That Newness of Life, and godliness of Conversation, as
 “ fruits of Faith, are required in the Partakers of this
 “ Table, we may learn by eating of the typical Lamb,
 “ whereunto no man was admitted but he that was a Jew,
 “ and circumcis’d, and was before sanctified. Did our Cler-
 gy read this Homily, and consider it when they gave the
 sacramental Qualification to the Army and Navy-Officers ?
 Did they examine them of their knowledg in discerning
 the Lord’s Body, of their Repentance and New Obedi-
 ence ? Have they observed their newness and purity of
 Life succeeding their receiving the same ? Are they become
 new Men ? are their Sins a burden to them ? and have
 they unlearnt them their horrid practice of damning and
 sinking their own Souls, imprecating that terrible Justice
 of Heaven upon themselves, which the best Men upon
 Earth tremble to think of ? I say, if they have not obser-
 ved these changes, as well as foreknown the knowledg of
 their Communicants, they must conclude, that they have
 given the Cup of Damnation to many poor Creatures.

Thus

Thus you see that the sacred Institution of the Lord's Supper is recognized by the Articles of the Church of *England*, and that this and the other Ordinances of God, and all his Laws are not to be repeal'd by humane Powers and Ordinances. Read *Homil. V.* " Christ rehearsing the
 " Commandments declared, That the Laws of God be
 " the very way that doth lead to everlasting Life, and
 " not the Traditions and Laws of Men. *To. 2. Hom. II.*
 " Containing the immutable Law and Ordinances of God,
 " in no Age or Time to be altered ; nor of any Persons,
 " of any Nation, of any Age to be disobey'd. This
 is scriptural Truth in downright English. As also
To. 2. Hom. X. " Let us esteem the holy Table of God's
 " Word, appointed by him to instruct us in all necessary
 " Works, so that we may be perfect before him in the
 " whole Course of our Life. *To. 1. Hom. I. p. 3.* " Such
 " hath been the corrupt Inclination of Man, ever super-
 " stitiously given to make new honouring of God of his
 " own head, and then to have more Affection and Devo-
 " tion to keep that, than to search out God's Holy Com-
 " mandments, and to keep them, and separate and sever
 " God's Commandments from the Commandments of Men.
 This is spoken in their Homilies concerning the moral Laws
 of God and the Decalogue : But see what they say con-
 cerning the Laws of Christ. *To. 1. Hom. V. p. 2.*
 " Christ reprov'd the Laws and Traditions made by the
 " Scribes and Pharisees, which were not only for good or-
 " der of the People (as the civil Laws were) but they
 " were set up so high, that they were made to be right
 " and pure worshipping of God, as they had been equal
 " with God's Laws or above them ; for many of God's
 " Laws could not be kept, but were fain to give way
 " unto them. This Arrogancy God detested, that Man
 " should so advance his Laws to make them equal with
 " God's

“ God’s Laws, wherein the true honouring and right wor-
 “ shipping of God standeth, as to make his Laws for them
 “ to be left off. God hath appointed his Laws, whereby
 “ his Pleasure is to be honoured—They were not con-
 “ tent to have them called by the name of other tempo-
 “ ral Laws, but called them *holy* and *godly* Traditions ;
 “ and would have them not only esteemed for a right and
 “ true worshipping of God (as God’s Laws be indeed) but
 “ also for the most high honouring of God, to which
 “ the Commandments of God should give place. And
 “ for this Cause did Christ so vehemently speak against
 “ them.

This is what is contained in the Doctrines of the Church
 of *England* ; and yet those very Men who own the Doc-
 trines of the Church, and subscribe to its Articles, can
 trample upon the Laws of Christ, and make his Ordi-
 nances only as so many steps to raise ’em high enough to
 get a superiority over the Laity. Well had it been for
 Religion if the antient Order of the Church had conti-
 nued, and that these Homilies full of Gospel-Truths had
 never been josted out by Sermons, which hath given an op-
 portunity to every factious Clergyman to sow from the
 Pulpit the Seeds of Division : thus the Laity would have
 been instructed in the more material Truths of the Gospel
 necessary to Salvation, instead of the enslaving Falshoods
 of Passive-Obedience and Non-resistance, and the Arbitra-
 ry Notions of Conquest ; our Clergy would not have
 been, as we have found them, a parcel of Brushes only
 to kindle Faggots of Sedition, and to calculate new in-
 enslaving Doctrines for the Meridian of every Government,
 whilst Religion languishes beneath its own weight, and
 they preach up the Rights of *Cæsar* so much beyond his
 just due, that God is deny’d his Sovereignty as the supreme
 Governour and Lawgiver of his Church. I now come

III. To prove that receiving the Sacrament as a Qualification for an Office, is contrary to the Doctrines and Principles of the *Presbyterians* and other Dissenters from the Church of *England*.

The Assembly of Divines in their larger Catechism, which is the Body of Divinity of the *Presbyterians*, give this Definition of a Sacrament. " A Sacrament is a holy
 " Ordinance instituted by Christ in his Church, to signify,
 " seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the Cove-
 " nant of Grace, the Benefits of his Mediation, to
 " strengthen and increase their Faith, and all other Graces;
 " to oblige them to Obedience; to testify and cherish their
 " Love and Communion one with another, and to distin-
 " guish them from those that are without. Here's not one
 word of a Civil Office either expressed or imply'd. What
 the Lord's Supper is they tell us, *Page 139. Larger Cate-*
chism; " The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament of the New
 " Testament, wherein by giving and receiving Bread and
 " Wine, according to the Appointment of Jesus Christ,
 " his Death is shewed forth; and they that worthily com-
 " municate, feed upon his Body and Blood, to their spi-
 " ritual nourishment and growth in Grace; have their
 " Union and Communion with him confirm'd, testify and
 " renew their thankfulness and engagement to God, and
 " their mutual Love and fellowship each with other as
 " Members of the same mystical Body.

So in their Confession of Faith agreed unto by the Kirk
 of *Scotland*. Chap. XXIX. p. 1. *Our Lord Jesus Christ in*
the Night wherein he was betray'd, instituted the Sacrament
of his Body and Blood called the Lord's Supper, to be ob-
served in his Church unto the end of the World, for the perpe-
tual remembrance of the Sacrifice of himself in his Death, the
sealing.

sealing all Benefits thereof unto true Believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further Engagement in and to all Duties which they owe unto him, and to be a Bond and Pledg of their Communion with him and with each other, as Members of his mystical Body. We cannot find here one word that so much as hints at a secular End in this Sacrament. I shall in the next place give you the Qualifications they acknowledg necessary in such as receive this Sacrament. In their larger Catechism, p. 140. they say, They that receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are before they come to prepare themselves thereunto, by examining themselves of their being in Christ, of their Sins and want of the Truth, and measure of their Knowledg, Faith, Repentance, Love to God and the Brethren; Charity to all men, forgiving those that have done them wrong; of their desires after Christ, and of their new Obedience by renewing the Exercise of these Graces, by serious Meditation and fervent Prayer. Also Directory, p. 33. The ignorant and scandalous are not fit to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Confession of Faith, Chap. XXIX. p. 8. Although ignorant and wicked Men receive the outward Elements in this Sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signify'd thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto, are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord to their own Damnation. Wherefore, all ignorant and ungodly Persons, as they are unfit to enjoy Communion with him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's Table; and cannot without great Sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy Mysteries, or be admitted thereunto. This is their own Doctrine, and yet have they allow'd their People to receive the Sacrament with the Church of England as a Qualification for an Office, with no other preparation thereunto than a secular Commission: and when such Officers have afterwards been accus'd of publick Frauds, have admitted them to the Sacrament, without enquiry in-

to their Behaviour, or any visible signs of Repentance and New Obedience. This Practice looks as if they had abandon'd their old Tenents, and were become Courtiers to such a degree, that they are not now of their own Party. We find hitherto they own the Sacrament to be God's Ordinance instituted by Christ as Lawgiver and Head of his Church. Let us now proceed and enquire, whether they allow God's Laws may be superseded, vacated, altered, converted, or applied to secular Ends and Purposes.

In their Confession of Faith, Chap XXXIII. *God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the World, hath ordained Civil Magistrates to be under him.*—P. 3. *The Civil Magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; yet hath Authority, and it is his Duty to take order, that Unity and Peace be preserved in the Church, that the Truths of God be kept pure and entire, that all Blasphemies and Heresies be suppressed, all Corruptions and Abuses in Worship and Discipline prevented or reformed: And all the Ordinances of God duly settled, administred and observed.* Chap. XXV. p. 6. *There is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ.* Larger Catechism, p. 106. *What God forbids is at no time to be done, what he commands is always our Duty.* God has no where commanded the receiving of the Sacrament as a human Ordinance (for such it is where appropriated to a human End) but he has every where in his Word declared against and forbid it.

In their Advice to the Lords and Commons concerning Church-Government, they say, *The Ministry, Oracles and Ordinances of the New Testament are given by Jesus Christ to the General Church visible, for the gathering and perfecting of it in this Life, until his second coming.*

Thus have I given you an Account of the Dissenters in relation to the nature of its Institution, End, and Design:
so

so that you see they are Orthodox enough in their Principles; they allow God that Sovereignty in Profession, which they will not allow him in Practice. I shall therefore close this Head with considering the Dissenters in their dissenting Capacity from the Church of *England*, and consider how far as such their Principles will allow them to take the Sacrament with the Church of *England* for an Employment.

What I have before recited from the received Opinions of the Dissenters concerning the nature of the Sacrament, is enough to prove, that it is illegal to receive the Communion even with their own Churches upon the foresaid Account: But that upon the same account they can communicate with a Church from which they dissent, is a mere Mystery. This is like some honest Citizen that sits in his Shop and rails against Highwaymen, yet ever and anon steps out himself to get a booty upon the Road. When we know Mens avowed Principles, we might rationally conclude what was their practice, for in this case we are mistaken. These have one Religion in their Congregations, and another in the Government; they blow hot and cold, and to speak within the Bounds of Charity, I cannot believe such Men to have any other Religion than their Interest.

Far be it from me to enter into the Secrets of the Almighty, or to pass a rash Judgment on the Memory of him who suffer'd so much (when living) under the most wicked and unjust Judgment that ever was. But I cannot forbear to observe, how in the late Reign it pleased God in his wise Providence to permit the Popish Faction to glut themselves with the innocent Blood of that Person, who was one of the first of the eminent *Presbyterians* that communicated with the Church of *England* to qualify himself for the Office of Sheriff of *London*; which Office prov'd his Snare, and rais'd him up those Enemies who procur'd his Death.

I know that they distinguish (or rather shuffle) betwixt Occasional and Constant Communion; and therefore I shall here a little consider this thing call'd Occasional Communion. By Occasional Communion I understand no more than this, That if a Member of a Congregation by the Providence of God be so far from his own Church that he cannot communicate, and in a place where there is a Congregation of Christians in Communion one with another according to the Word, that upon this occasion he may warrantably communicate with them. But when a Presbyterian is in *London*, and perhaps nearer his own Church than any of the Churches by Law established, what occasion has he to pass by his own Church, and communicate with the Church of *England* one day in the year, and all the rest in his own Church? I leave any unprejudiced Person to judg whether it is his Religion or Interest, the Worship of God, or his Office that is the occasion of his Communion.

Whatsoever is occasional is acted in an Opportunity I have of doing something which I thought not of before, and which, if that Opportunity had not presented, I should not have done. But in this case, where the End and Design of the Action is pre-considered, and the Effect of it fore-judg'd, 'tis the Interest of the Person seeks out the occasion and opportunity of putting that Interest into Action. Here is nothing in this case of Occasion or Accident. I have no occasion to do a thing which I may let alone, or to suffer an Evil which I may avoid, or to communicate with a Church which I think corrupt, or at least hesitate about its soundness when I can communicate with a Church I believe is pure in its Fundamentals.

The great difference betwixt the Presbyterians and the Church of *England* is about Circumstantials and things indifferent; they both agree that kneeling at the Sacrament is no essential part of it, or absolutely necessary; nay, not the Sacrament it self essential to Salvation, for

non Privatio Sacramentorum, sed Contemptus damnat. And yet by the practice of both they acknowledg that the Sacrament it self is essential to an Office. Thus is the holy Ordinance of God made a Stalking-Horse to every Man's private Interest; the *Auri sacra fames*, is a most powerful thing, and brings Votaries even from the very horns of the Altars.

The other Dissenters owning this practice neither in Principle nor Fact, are not to be consider'd under this Head.

IV. What remains to be proved is, That the Sacrament imposed as a Test on such as bear Offices, is contrary to the National and Natural Rights of Mankind.

We are born to some Rights as we are Men, to others as we are Natives of such or such a Country: but this Imposition is destructive of both these Rights; as Men, we have a natural Right to the use of our Reason, and the exercise of our intellectual Faculties, which cannot be restrain'd legally, but by force of Reason and Argument; and here the Understanding becomes rationally passive, and exerts the highest Freedom in submitting to the cogent Rules of Reason. Man is no free Agent whilst his Understanding is shackl'd by forcible and coercive Statutes. Nor would I be understood here to intend that the Civil Magistrate has not a Power to compel, by Mulcts and Penalties, vicious Mankind to the Observance of wholesom Laws, contrary to the determinations of corrupt Reason; but what is here intended is no more than this, that the Secular Arm has no power coercive over the Minds of Men in matters of Religion, so as to force them to act contrary to the Word of God revealed in Scripture, of which their Minds are rightly apprised. It may here be objected, That Men are not forc'd in this case to take an Employment: To which I answer, In some cases they are not, and in others they are; they are not forc'd to take an Office of Profit under the King, here is no Compulsion: But
however

however they are by this Act kept back by a forcible and penal Resistance, without it they cannot be Officers; and so their natural Right to the freedom of their Fellow Subjects is destroy'd. In some Cases they are ground between two Millstones, *viz.* this Act, and the Charters and By-Laws of the Cities and Corporations of which they are Denisons. The Act obliges them to take the Sacrament, as Mayors, Aldermen, Sheriffs, &c. Their Charters and By-Laws punish them with severe Mulcts if they are elected, and do not hold their Offices. And what is the Cause of this? Only the Act which obliges them to go contrary to their natural Reason, or what is worse, contrary to their Consciences, or else submit to the fine of their Fellow-Citizens. Thus those that have served their Time and chargeable Offices in a City, are deny'd bearing any further Office either honourable or profitable, unless they make their Consciences subservient to their Interest.

As we are Natives of a Country, by our being born in that Country, we have a natural and indisputable Right to all the Freedoms, Immunities and Franchises of it, such a Right as no Power on Earth can deprive Mankind of; nay such a Right, that a Man himself cannot give away or bequeath to another: for no Man can make another a Native of *England* that was not born in *England*. This Right is hereditary, and not to be rescinded by any Will or deed of Gift, but descends to Posterity by a natural Entail. If my Father be guilty of Treason, he loses his Freedom, and becomes a Prisoner, he loses his Life, and forfeits his Estate to the Crown: now tho by my Father's Forfeiture I lose my Patrimony; yet by that Act of his I do not lose my Right to my Liberty and Property, which he enjoy'd before he became a Delinquent; I am *rectus in Curia*, my Cause is pleadable at Bar, and I have an equal right to *common Justice* with the rest of my Fellow-Subjects.

To apply this to the Case in hand. The Dissenters are

born in *England*, are the natural People of their King and Country, and have a National Right to the Immunities and Privileges of their Country, and their Prince's Favour: But by this Act they are Bastardized, and depriv'd of their Birthright. It will be objected, that they are only deny'd the Favour of their Prince in point of Offices: But still this is debarring them of their National Right; for the Government is supported in common by all the good People of *England*, and those that plant a Tree, prune and water it, ought to have the advantage of its shadow; either admit 'em to Offices, or exempt 'em from Taxes: 'tis cruel to raise Mony upon 'em, to pay Salaries to those that rob them of their Birthright.

They'l tell you the Reason why these Hardships are put upon Protestant Dissenters is, because they differ from the Church establish'd, are Enemies to Monarchy, and Promoters of Sedition. I must here beg leave to clear up this point, and justify the Dissenters, so far as to prove that their Grievance in this kind is an intolerable Hardship and unnatural Oppression.

Were they not as early in the Revolution as any? Did they ever question the legality of the present Settlement, or any ways endeavour to embarrass the Affairs of his Majesty? I am very loth to recriminate: But who were those that withdrew from the House of Lords, and gain'd a Party of *Nonjurors* to the Government, when it was yet in its Infancy, surrounded with potent Enemies at home and abroad? were they not of the Church? Who oppos'd the Recognition-Bill? were they not the same Persons? Who embarrass'd his Majesty's Affairs in the Commons House? were they not of that number? Who were they that entred into that damnable Assassination-Plot against his Majesty's Life? were they not for the most part composed of such Men? Who betray'd our Fleets into the Enemies hands? Who let the *Thoulon* Squadron into *Brest*? Who favour'd the escape of *Pointi*? Who betray'd *Talmash's* Descent?

Descent? Who have carried on our Mismanagements by Sea and Land? Are they not the same Persons spoken of before? I could proceed much further, were it not an invidious Subject, and my Design to compose, not to augment differences.

Can they recriminate upon the Dissenters any farther than to say that they are loyal to excess? A small Crime in poor Creatures that never knew what a good King was before. Do they leap and rejoice? well they may, when they are eas'd of such heavy Burdens, which broke the Necks and very Hearts of their Forefathers; they are newly come out of the Dungeon of Thralldom, and perhaps their Eyes so dazle at the Sunshine of Liberty, that they do not take such regular steps as they ought, but run into a Court-Interest without thinking. But sure the Church cannot blame them for this; they are perhaps now willing to fill up the measure of Loyalty they wanted in the late Reigns; and I am positive if ever Loyalty was due from that sort of People to an English King, it is at this time.

It is not their fault that they have not stood by his Majesty with their Lives as they have done with their Fortunes; it's the fault of your Sacramental Act, which will let no Man have his Brains beat out in the service of his Country, but he that dips his Commission in God's holy Ordinance. 'Tis well that Act did not deny his Majesty their Assistance in point of Money; if so, his Majesty's Affairs would have been more embarras'd: For if you look into the Loans at *Guild-hall*, you'll find the Purses of the Dissenters have been very generously open to his Majesty's Assistance; 'tis a hard Case that his Majesty, who is the common Father of his People, should be indulgent to some, and a Step-father to others, who pay him the highest Duty and Respect.

It is much to be feared that this Act is kept in force by the diligent Application of a sort of People among us, who are no real Friends to their Country, otherwise they would not suffer his Majesty's hands to be tied up from the Service of such as are intirely in his Interest: for those that are Friends to their Country, would rather augment than diminish the number of such as are capable to defend it. What will after Ages say of us, if we

Should have our Country invaded by a greater strength than such as are qualify'd by Law to defend it, and have it conquer'd in the sight of one 3^d of its People, who are disarm'd contrary to the Laws of God and Nature, and render'd incapable of defending themselves and the place of their Nativity? This is teaching them Passive-Obedience and Non-Resistance with a witness, and making them one intire *Theban* Legion.

And suppose the Jacobites are one third more of the People of *England*, who will certainly join with the Invaders: then we have but one third of qualified Persons to withstand the Invaders. Now let any rational Man judg whether the native strength of the Kingdom be not abominably weakened by this Act,

Whatever this sort of Men may think, and whatever their Designs may be, I can tell them that every Man in *England* who is a Native of this Country, is qualify'd by the Laws of God and Nature to defend it, without taking the Sacrament; for, as I said before, every one born in *England* has a right to the Liberties and Properties of the People of *England*; and without doubt he that has a Property in a thing, has a right to defend that Property; for Defence is included in the very Notion of Property: Our Estates are defended from illegal Claims in lawful Courts of Judicature; but when our Estates are invaded by Force of Arms, the Laws of Self-preservation and defence empower us to repel such Force: so that I would not have this sort of People imagine in such an Emergency, the Dissenters of *England* will stand still and see their Country taken from them, and suffer themselves to be sacrificed on its Ruins.

It would be well if the Clergy of this Nation, who think their Church in danger without this Act of Parliament, would instead of their Doctrines of Passive-Obedience and Non-Resistance, preach up to the People the necessity of Self-defence, and this present Government: one is much more their indispensable Duty than the other; the one is unwarranted by the Laws of God and contrary to the Laws of Nature, the other their Duty enjoin'd them both by the Laws of God, Nature, and the Laws of the Land, as appears by the Statute *Anno 34 Edw. I.* call'd, *De Tallagio non concedendo*, confirming several Privileges to the People; amongst which, That the King shall raise no Money, or lay any Burdens upon the People, without consent of Parliament: The 6th Article of which is, " And for
" the more Assurance of this thing, we Will and Grant that
" all

“ all Archbishops and Bishops for ever, shall read this present
 “ Charter in Cathedral Churches twice in the year, and upon
 “ reading thereof in every of their Parish-Churches shall open-
 “ ly denounce accursed all those that willingly do procure to be
 “ done any thing contrary to the Tenour, Force, and Effect of
 “ this present Charter in any Point and Article. There was
 a Sentence of the Clergy against the Breakers of the *Charta Fo-*
resta, call'd, *Sententia lata super Chartas*; as also the Curse of
 the Bishops in *Regno Hen. 3.* against the Breakers of the *Great*
Charter, both of them omitted (for some reason to be sure) in
 our Modern Statute-Book, but to be seen at large in that print-
 ed in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, *An. 1557.* But instead of holding
 the Breakers of our fundamental Rights accursed, we have from
 the Pulpits pray'd God to pour on their heads his special Blessings,
 and from thence have told the People, that we ought not to resist
 the Lord's Anointed, tho he were doing the Devil's Work,
 and bringing freeborn Englishmen into Slavery and Bondage.

Under intolerable Oppressions did the Laity groan in the late
 Reigns, their Liberties betray'd by despotick Power, their Char-
 ters taken away without Law or Justice. Did this affect the Cler-
 gy? no, they preach'd up their enslaving Doctrines still, and
 never join'd with the Laity in the recovery of their Rights, till
 the Popish Foxes worried the Lambs of the Church, till the
 Invasion of *Magdalen College*, and the seven golden Candle-
 sticks were sent to hold Candles to light the Rats of the Tower;
 but have ever by their Artifices and compulsive Laws, by the
 inarticulate sound of a Church gain'd a bigotted Party to them-
 selves, who are grown so high Churchmen, that they overlook
 their native Freedoms, and plot against themselves.

'Tis this sort of Men that keep this Act on foot, and there-
 by keep a great part of the native strength of our Kingdom
 out of its service, contrary to the Laws of God and Nature,
 which may in time prove the ruin of the most flourishing Realm
 in the Universe.

It is only in the Power of our Representatives in Parliament,
 to redress this great Evil, to give God and Mankind their due:
 not only the Law of God is profaned and wrested by this
 Act, but even the Act it self is wrested to the prejudice of our
 Protestant Dissenters, against whom it was never intended. I
 know the Power of Parliaments is very great: Parliaments are
 our Constitution, and without them our Government is dissolv-
 ed.

ed: But the Power of Parliaments is derived from the People they represent, and in some degree they are prescrib'd and limited in their Actions. Here they cannot by any means vacate and annul the Laws of God. I would fain know from whom they had a Power to enact this Sacramental Test? not from God; nor from the People they represent, who cannot enable them to exert a Power which they themselves have not: for *nemo dat quod non habet*; they cannot destroy the Liberty of the People; they are not by them commissioned upon this Account, but on the contrary sit in that House as Guardians of the Peoples Liberties, to make Laws confirming and corroborating the Peoples antient Rights, and their free Customs; and I very much wonder that since this Revolution no Act has past recognizing the Liberties of the good People of *England*.

Without doubt the Laws of God are under the Care of our Representatives; they may make Laws penal, inforcing the Laws of God; for the Punishments and Judgments against the Breakers of God's Laws in the Scripture being invisable and future, Men are not so much deter'd from the breaking of them as by penal Statutes: therefore they may make Laws *circa sacra*, but not *in sacris*; they may make Laws enforcing the Observation of God's Holy Ordinances, but can make no Ordinances of their own in Divine Worship.

When a Parliament shall constitute a Church upon other foundations than those upon which the Church of Christ is built, and shall espouse the Interest of this Church exclusive of all other Churches, they are not the true Representatives of the People, but dwindle into a Convocation, and only represent that Church whose Interest they espouse. Now our Constitution is such, that our Representatives do represent in common all the good People of *England*, Natives of this Country, and are to act in defence of their antient Laws and Liberties, their free Customs and Birthrights; and we find that the Dissenters are by them represented, by their being included in all Mony-Bills, as also by their Privilege of voting at Elections: so that they being part of his Majesty's natural born People, 'tis hoped the Honourable House of Commons will let them have an equal share of the favour of the Crown, since it is so much for the advantage of the Realm.

